

Unity is not the enemy of diversity

There are those in the 'diversity community' who see every attempt to unify Americans as a threat to their particular ethnic, racial or social organization's right to exist. I'm here to tell you that those people are not on the side of those of us who believe in a one-nation concept. They do not support us when we try to strengthen our American bond by looking for common ground that cuts across our many diverse groups. They are convinced that the only reason we do that is to maintain control in the hands of the 'White power elites' at the expense of all America's minorities. In other words, the attempt to unify is suspect. No matter that civil rights leaders of the 20th century like Martin Luther King, Jr. worked toward that end. King understood that bringing people together under the same banner would win real gains. Separating them, like the Nation of Islam advocates would only prevent our nation from becoming 'color blind.'

The same is true of ethnic groups like Hispanics. Any move towards enforcing our immigration laws is seen as being 'racist' (the word they're looking for is *prejudiced* not *racist* because Hispanics are not a race but an ethnic group). No matter. Deporting those who entered our country illegally is construed as being anti-diversity. We are told to look the other way and allow them to keep coming because they are mistreated by their own countries' leaders. In other words, exceptions should be made for them because we need more diversity (minority immigrants), and more of that kind of illegal immigrant is good for America.

What kind of cockeyed logic is that? Do advocates of open borders not realize the economic impact that a flood of illegal immigrants from whichever country would have on our economy? Do they not know that allowing hundreds of thousands if not millions of people in who don't speak our language or have an appreciation of our values would have a negative impact on their ability to live peaceably, side-by-side with us?

Previous immigrants of the 1850s and post-WWI times were encouraged to assimilate and to learn our American ways and language. The goal here wasn't to eliminate diversity; it was because we wanted to encourage unity. A unified society was a stronger society. A well-educated society was a wiser society. A society that valued its diverse ethnic, language differences and traditions but placed them after their desire to become 'e pluribus unum' (one out of many) was a healthier society.

The unity I'm speaking of is not grounded solely in language or respect for our history, but rather one of solidarity of purpose - of agreement with our Bill of Rights and Constitution. Both those documents weren't written for one ethnic, religious or racial group, alone. They were created to "form a more perfect union" - to ensure that no one group would dominate the others. That's their beauty!

There is an economic component to the *diversity first* crowd and it is money! Surprised? You shouldn't be because all of the various ethnic or special interest groups need to make money to survive and to fight all of us who they perceive are intent on denying them their rightful seat at the table. In short, they need the *diversity first* issue to keep them afloat. Here are a few numbers that ought to interest you from some of those organizations...

- **NAACP** (2018) Budget = \$24.8 million, number of members = 500,000
- **Southern Poverty Law Center** (2018) Assets \$518.5 million, liabilities = \$25.7 million, public support = \$110.6 million
- **United We Dream** (2017) Income \$15.5 million, assets = \$11.6 million, liabilities = \$169K
- **Glaad** (2018) Assets = \$17 million, liabilities = \$929K

While it's clear that the first order of business for any for-profit is survival, diversity organizations have an additional mission. Theirs is to remove the disparities that may exist in our society that are rooted in race, ethnic and 'lifestyle' inequality. That begs the obvious question: How much money is necessary for these organizations to complete that mission and how long should it take?

Are they putting themselves on a path to become obsolete when those inequalities disappear or do they wish to become part of an alternative establishment that is self-perpetuating? Do they have more to gain by dragging their feet when it comes to accomplishing their goals than they would by eradicating those disparities? I would submit that once such an entity is formed it sees its future as one of an eternal guaranteed lifespan that needn't track with the gains made in achieving their diversity objectives. The two are seemingly not related in today's world, but they should be.

Finally, the goal of unifying America under one banner is not discriminatory nor is it a binary, either/or choice with diversity. Lincoln said it best, "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

Stephan Helgesen is a retired career U.S. diplomat who lived and worked in 30 countries for 25 years during the Reagan, G.H.W. Bush, Clinton, and G.W. Bush Administrations. He is the author of three books on American politics and seven others and has written over 1,000 articles on politics, economics and social trends. He can be reached at: stephan@stephanhelgesen.com